

REMARKS

The present response amends claims 16, 20, and 21 in conformity with the following remarks. Claims 1-24 remain pending in the captioned case. Further examination and reconsideration of the presently claimed application are respectfully requested.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter contained in dependent claims 21-24. However, as discussed in more detail below, it is believed the present claims are allowable over the art of record in their present form.

Section 102 Rejection

Claims 1-9 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0041624 to Hui et al. (hereinafter "Hui"). The standard for "anticipation" is one of fairly strict identity. A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art of reference. *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987); MPEP 2131. Furthermore, anticipation requires the presence in a single prior art reference disclosure of each and every element of the claimed invention, as arranged in the claim. *W.L. Gore & Assocs. V. Garlock*, 721 F.2d 1540, 220 USPQ 303 (Fed. Cir. 1983). Using these standards, Applicants submit the cited art fails to disclose each and every element of the currently pending claims, some distinctive features of which are set forth in more detail below.

Hui does not teach or suggest an apparatus for scattering radiated energy. Claim 1 defines an apparatus arranged between first and second antennas. The apparatus intercepts electromagnetic energy from the first antenna during transmission of a first signal from that antenna. The apparatus is configured for scattering the radiated energy away from the second antenna.

The Office Action alleges that Hui includes an apparatus for scattering radiated energy. Applicants respectfully disagree. While Hui teaches a “firewall,” Hui makes clear that the purpose of the firewall is to mitigate interference from one antenna to the next by absorbing electromagnetic interference (Hui -- ¶¶ 0009, 0014, 0069-72, 0078, 0080-81). In particular, Hui denotes firewall 810 as a conductive trace “with one end connected to ground and the other end left open” (Hui -- ¶ 0069). The open end is formed between the two antennas. Since the other end is grounded, the open end absorbs electromagnetic energy radiated from an interfering transmitting antenna to ground. By absorbing the radiated interference, firewall 810 of Hui prevents the radiated antenna from being “re-radiated via the GPS [other] antenna 400” (Hui -- ¶ 0069). In fact, the major purpose of firewall 810 is to “reduce scattered electromagnetic interference” (Hui -- ¶ 0069). Reducing scattered electromagnetic interference is directly opposite that which is described in present claim 1. By absorbing the interference through the firewall to ground, Hui specifically teaches the opposite of present claim 1.

Hui does not teach or suggest an apparatus comprising a plurality of elements for intercepting electromagnetic energy and redirecting the radiated energy. Present claim 16 describes a particular configuration for an apparatus wherein the apparatus comprises a plurality of elements, such as elements 710 (Fig. 7A-7F) or elements 1010, 1110 (Figs. 10A-11C) described in the present specification. While Hui may suggest redirecting radiated energy by absorbing the energy to ground, Hui specifically requires a single conductive trace for doing so (Hui -- ¶ 0069). The single conductive trace has opposing ends, with one end open and the other coupled to ground (Hui -- ¶ 0069). There is no suggestion in Hui that a plurality of elements can be used, whether those elements are arranged linearly or in an array, nor using multiple elements to redirect radiated energy.

Applicants respectfully disagree with the characterizations made as to claims 3, 4, and 9. For example, Hui does not note where the firewall is placed proximate to the first or second antenna. In addition, Hui does not suggest a first and second antenna surrounded partially by a non-conductive external surface.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants believe independent claims 1 and 16, as well as claims dependent therefrom, are not anticipated by the cited art. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request removal of this rejection.

Section 103 Rejection

Claims 10-15 and 17-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over a combination of Hui, U.S. Patent No. 6,752,320 to Herranen (“Herranen”), U.S. Patent No. 6,654,231 to Teshima (hereinafter “Teshima”), and U.S. Patent No. 5,905,467 to Narayanaswamy et al. (hereinafter “Narayanaswamy”). This rejection is respectfully traversed. Herranen and Hui cannot be properly combined absent a suggestion in either such reference for integrating the apparatus into an expansion card or sub-assembly for detachable coupling to the internal components of the system as presently claimed. In addition, Teshima does not provide the nexus lacking in Hui for coupling a first antenna, second antenna, and apparatus to an external surface of the system for supporting and/or encasing internal components of that system as set forth in present claim 11. Moreover, Narayanaswamy is absent any teaching for spacing a pair of antennas dependent on a wavelength of a first signal sent from a first antenna, or a dimension of the surface upon which the antennas are coupled as set forth in present claim 17.

For at least the reasons set forth above and those discussed in reference to the 102 rejection, Applicants assert that dependent claims 10-15 and 17-20 are patentably distinct over the cited art. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request removal of this rejection.

CONCLUSION

The present amendment and response is believed to be a complete response to the issues raised in the Office Action mailed February 7, 2006. In view of remarks herein, Applicants assert that pending claims 1-24 are in condition for allowance. If the Examiner has any questions, comments or suggestions, the undersigned attorney earnestly requests a telephone conference.

No fees are required for filing this amendment; however, the Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Daffer McDaniel, LLP Deposit Account No. 50-3268.

Respectfully submitted,
/Kevin L. Daffer/
Kevin L. Daffer
Reg. No. 34,146
Attorney for Applicant(s)

Daffer McDaniel, LLP
P.O. Box 684908
Austin, TX 78768-4908
(512) 476-1400
Date: May 5, 2006